

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending. Claims 1-18 are rejected by this Office Action. The Applicant previously filed a preliminary amendment to amend the title to "A Goal Based System, Utilizing a Table Based Architecture".

This Office Action acknowledges the Applicant's claim for priority based on US Application No. 09/218,945 filed on December 22, 1998.

Information Disclosure Statement

The Applicant is filing an IDS as a separate paper. The IDS contains the date of publication for all the references.

Drawings

The Applicant is submitting a Request to Modify Drawings in a separate paper. The Office Action notes that item 234 is missing from Fig. 2. The Applicant has amended the specification (page 4, line 2) to delete reference to item 234. Consequently, Figure 2 is not being modified. The Applicant has modified Figure 19 to be more closely linked to the Fig. items explained on page 19, lines 15-23 as requested by the Office Action. The Applicant has amended page 19, lines 15-23 in the specification to correspond to the changes in the drawings. No new subject matter has been added.

Specification

The Applicant has submitting the Abstract. The contents of the Abstract are contained in item "57 Abstract" of the specification as originally filed. No new subject matter has been added.

The Applicant has amended the paragraph from page 3, line 33 to page 4, line 6 so that all references to item 230 refer to "System Dynamics Engine", the reference to item 250 refers to "System Dynamics Model", the reference to item 270 refers to "Intelligent Coaching Agent", and the reference to item 240 refers to "Simulation Engine". The amendments are consistent with what are shown in Figure 2. Also, reference to item 234 has been deleted because Figure 2 does not show item 234.

The Applicant has amended the paragraph from page 4, line 7 to page 4, line 14 so that the reference to item 242 refers to "Deliver Feedback" and the reference to item 238 refers to "Inputs Outputs". The amendments are consistent with what are shown in Figure 2.

The Applicant has amended the paragraph from page 19, line 15 to page 19, line 23 to be consistent Figure 19 as amended. The amendments to Figure 19 were requested by the Office Action as discussed above.

Claim Objections

Claim 10 is objected to by the Office Action. The Applicant has amended claim 10 so that steps of the claim are ordered from (a) through (e).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

Claims 1-9 are rejected by the Office Action under 35 USC 101 for being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Office Action further states, "If the abstract ideas of claim[s] 1-9 represented functional descriptive material consisting of data structures and computer programs which impart functionality when employed as a computer component (recorded on some computer readable medium), they become structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized." The Applicant has amended claims 1-9, in which each claim is directed to "computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions". Thus, the Applicant submits that claims 1-9 are directed to statutory subject matter and requests reconsideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-9 are rejected by the Office Action under 35 USC 112, first paragraph because of the rejections of claims 1-9 under 35 USC 101. Claims 1-9 have been amended, as discussed above. Thus, the Applicant requests reconsiderations of claims 1-9.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8, 10-12, 14-15, and 17 are rejected by the Office Action under 34 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. 5,694,601 (White). The Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the feature of "receiving information indicative of a goal, **the goal being associated with a student in a specific task**". (Emphasis added.) The present patent application, for example, teaches (Page 12, lines 16-20. Emphasis added.):

A good way to gain a better appreciation for how the BusSim Toolset can vastly improve the BusSim development effort is to walk through scenarios of how the tools would be used throughout the development lifecycle of a particular task in a BusSim application. For this purpose, we'll assume that **the goal of the student in a specific task** is to journalize invoice transactions, and that this task is within the broader context of learning the fundamentals of financial accounting. A cursory

description of the task from the student's perspective will help set the context for the scenarios.

However, White, as cited by the Office Action, teaches (Column 26, lines 31-37. Emphasis added.):

To achieve **the goal of data interchange in an environment which permits real-time transaction modification**, working storage is defined independently from the external views (import, export, profile). A view consists of a set of data elements, which can be "primitive" items or "sets" of data elements. The recursive definition allows arbitrarily complex structures.

White does not teach or even suggest "receiving information indicative of a goal, the goal being associated with a student in a specific task". White merely teaches about "the goal of data interchange in an environment which permits real-time transaction modification". The Applicant has similarly amended claim 10 to include "logic that integrates information that motivates accomplishment of the goal for use in the presentation, the goal being associated with a student in a specific task". Claims 2-3, 5-6, 8, 11-12, 14-15, and 17 depend from independent claims 1 and 10 and thus are not anticipated by White for the at least the above reasons. The Applicant requests for reconsideration of claims 1-3, 5-6, 8, 10, 12, 14-15, and 17.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 4, 7, 9, 13, 16, and 18 are rejected by the Office Action under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over White in view of US 5,827,020 (Kershaw) and further view of US 5,701,400 (Amado). As discussed above, regarding claims 1 and 10, White does not teach or even suggest the features of "receiving information indicative of a goal, the goal being associated with a student in a specific task" and "logic that integrates information that motivates accomplishment of the goal for use in the presentation, the goal being associated with a student in a specific task". Moreover Kershaw and Amado do not make up for the deficiencies of White. Claims 4, 7, 9, 13, 16, and 18 depend from claims 1 and 10 and are thus patentable over White in view of Kershaw and Amado. The Applicant requests for reconsideration of claims 4, 7, 9, 13, 16, and 18.

CONCLUSION

All objections and rejections have been addressed. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Date: May 3, 2004

Respectfully submitted,



Kenneth F. Smolik

Registration No. 44,344

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

10 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 3000

Chicago, IL 60606-7407

Telephone: 312-715-1000

Facsimile: 312-715 1234